



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CURRENT OPINION

The War and the Gospel

Dr. Adolph Deissmann of the University of Berlin has been sending a series of letters to different scholars in the United States. The following letter, which is his 57th "Protestant Weekly Letter," and which is dated December 31, 1915, is of more than local interest and sets forth the point of view of this distinguished German scholar:

The closing year reminds me of a debt, still unpaid, which must be attended to before the first day of 1916 has greeted us. It concerns a brotherly request, recently and repeatedly expressed from members among the Society of Friends in North America, viz., to say something about the great theme, "The War and the Gospel." To Mr. Edward C. Wood, member of the Board of Directors of the Christian Association of the University of Pennsylvania, Howard Houston Hall, West Philadelphia, Pa., I am especially indebted for having time and again attempted in touching words to present the arguments in favor of the truly biblical standpoint of "non-resistance." I am also grateful to him for having introduced me into the world of ideas and ideals of the American Friends through aptly chosen newspaper clippings, pamphlets, and sermons.

This correspondence with the Friends has given me much pleasure for a twofold reason: first, because of its manly frankness in declaring war against war, no matter who may be engaged in the same. Germany is wrong in carrying on war, but England also is guilty of the same crime; that is the sum and substance of all these letters. One American Friend even goes so far as to write: "Our President seems to be living in the Old Testament period of civilization, as most of Europe is doing."

In the second place, I am touched by the confidence which they seem to place in me

and my good will. I am very grateful for the same, and assure them that I shall never forget it. In this age when international hatred is holding its orgies, every manifestation of willingness for a square deal and mutual understanding acts like a firm grip of the hand. Just as I should never be writing these "Weekly Letters," did I not believe in the good-will of the people across the Atlantic, so I can assure you that this *bona voluntas* is not lacking with us either.

"Belonging to the Old Testament period," "un-Christian" the Quakers believe this conflict to be, as well as every other struggle, because our Savior commanded us to love our enemies, and exhorted us, especially, not "to resist him that is evil" (Matt. 5:39).

This point of view seems clear and its motivation is certainly biblical; without further argument I can truthfully say that I have the greatest respect for everyone who, for conscience' sake, and in the literal fulfilment of these words of Jesus, refuses to take up arms and keeps his distance from everything having the odor of gunpowder, even to the extent of personal martyrdom for his conviction. Nevertheless I am just as convinced that the problem of "resistance" and "war" is not solved by referring to these simple words of the Master.

The oftener I work over the Sermon on the Mount, the more evident it becomes to me: We dare not apply these words of Jesus, any more than his other sayings, as single paragraphs of a law code, nor dare we petrify the wonderful intentional paradox these words express by sticking to the exegesis of the letter. All the sayings of Jesus, being a reflex of his own thoughts, appeal to our sentiment and to our conscience; their purpose is not, like a manual of casuistry, to lay down good rules for every possible case, but to discipline our hearts and minds

toward that "perfection" which our heavenly Father possesses.

In the words referred to above, Jesus' aim is to train us in forbearance, indulgence, and willingness for sacrifice, yea in love, which includes even our enemy. The self-sacrificing love for our neighbor, which otherwise is the Alpha and Omega of the Master's mind and teaching, is on that account by no means set aside or made obsolete. There are numerous instances where, by abandoning resistance "to him that is evil," the love to the neighbor would be made of no effect. I cannot draw the unreal conclusion from Jesus' words that I must be an idle looker-on when robbers threaten the lives of the family members placed in my protecting care, when an attack on my person endangers the life of their bread-winner and educator, or when the freedom of my people is hazarded by a greatly superior enemy. In such instances I refer the right to defend my neighbor from this law of love—even at the point of the sword, if necessary.

Therefore personal or national self-defense in my opinion does not contradict the spirit of the gospel for this age. War as such, isolated from the bitter causality of the necessity of defense for national existence, is a mockery of the gospel. I feel this just as strongly as the sensitive and peace-loving soul of the Friends. Woe unto him who wilfully or presumptuously kindles any war. The distressing cry of the widow and orphan, the infant's wail, the sorrow of the blind, the halt, and the maimed, the smouldering ruins of human abode—all alike will once stand as his accusers before the judgment-seat of God. On the other hand, he who is forced to carry on a war in self-defense wishes to save his children from starvation, to protect the peaceful homes of his fellow-citizens, and, with the greatest possible self-sacrifice, he is even willing to stake his life for these highest ideals.

Just in this manly willingness to lay down his life for his people and country, the Christian can and does fulfil the highest ideal of love given by the Master: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:13), as well as that of the apostle, who like Jesus, considers it the highest duty of love "to lay down our lives for the brethren" (1 John 3:16).

As awful as war is in itself, and as great as the endeavor of every Christian must be to hinder, if possible, a recurrence of so horrible a tragedy as this present world-struggle, nevertheless many Christians, now, as in previous conflicts, though with bleeding hearts, have done their duty with a clear conscience.

A "Friend" asked me what I should do in case an Englishman attacked me with the intention to kill. This question is very difficult to answer theoretically while engaged in a peaceful task at my desk; I believe though, in such moments of immediate danger long deliberation has little space, and presume that even a "Friend," under similar circumstances, would resist without much consideration. At all events, I should try, with every means at my disposal, to hinder the Englishman's crime against his fellow-man. Thereby I take it for granted the question refers to an attack of an English civilian assaulting me as a civilian, perchance in Whitechapel or elsewhere. Should it refer to the attack of a soldier assaulting me as soldier in time of war, I would, without any personal malice toward my opponent, attempt to do my duty toward my country. I believe myself just as capable, however, of rushing to his immediate aid, should I have been compelled to wound him.

At a Christmas celebration with the students in my New Testament seminar at the University on the last Sunday in Advent, one student gave a short address under the candle-lit Christmas tree on the

subject: "The New Testament in Time of War." This young man is that same Uhlan volunteer, whose exegesis of Rom. 3:25 I communicated to you last winter. After many long months at the front, he was forced, on account of severe illness, to return home, and now in his Uhlan uniform is again pursuing his studies in theology. The fundamental note of his address, true to fact and full of Christian patriotism, was: During a war the New Testament does not affect a person so much as a book that is read, but rather as an energy manifesting itself outwardly. As an unspeakably great, yea, as even the greatest effect the New Testament has in time of war, this well-bred and gifted young man, who has tasted all the horrors of the conflict, characterized the spirit of unselfish sacrifice in which millions lay down their lives for the brethren—a sacrifice before the awful grandeur of which we stand in silent admiration. I wish to ask these "Friends" who have honored me by calling me their friend: Is this testimony of a fellow-combatant, who was not only a warrior, but a Christian at the same time—is not this testimony an all-important contribution, worthy of notice, to my answer to your question? What must certainly have been unsatisfactory from a purely theoretical standpoint will perhaps be understood more easily from this illustration based upon practical experience.

Proper Names on the Hebrew Ostraka

The *Expository Times* for November, 1915, contains an article by Rev. G. Buchanan Gray, D.Litt., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford. In this article Professor Gray discusses the list of proper names found on the Hebrew Ostraka, which the Harvard expedition discovered on the site of ancient Samaria. The article is of peculiar interest as coming from Dr. Gray, who has made a special study of this

large problem of proper names as a basis for historical knowledge of dates and of religion. In 1896 he published a work entitled *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, in which he particularly interested himself in the grouping and the significance of the group itself. He made eight groups. The first of these was made up of the pre-Davidic period; the second, contemporaries of David; the third, contemporaries of Jeremiah. In this grouping one perceives at once the wide gap between the contemporaries of David and the contemporaries of Jeremiah. Now the interesting fact is that this group of names from the Samaritan Ostraka of the Harvard expedition fills that gap.

There are from thirty to thirty-seven of these names, seven out of thirty-seven being indefinite enough to raise serious question whether they are names of individuals or of places. But thirty are unmistakable and valuable for their historical significance. They were found at the same depth as a vase inscribed with the name of Osorkon II of Egypt, whose date is given by Professor Breasted as 874-853 B.C. and therefore contemporary with Ahab (876-854 B.C.). Dr. Gray accepts conditionally the date as the ninth century. The script is essentially the same as that of the Siloam inscription and of the Moabite stone, which undoubtedly belong to the ninth century, and which mention Ahab of Israel as contemporary with its author, Mesha of Moab.

Dr. Gray goes into a study of the compounds of these names and finds there valuable material for historical purposes. He compares these with the list given in II Sam., chaps. 9-20. These names are nearly all compounded with the names of the Deity. Yah, El, and Baal are frequent and occur both at the beginning and at the end of a name. Such familiar names also as Elisha, El Nathan, Asa, Abiezer occur, as well as more doubtful ones, such as Akhimelek and Shemida, and such familiar

place-names as Shechem, Shaptan, and Aza. Some combinations show the element "Melek."

The whole matter is interesting as fixing a date of historical importance, and as contributing valuable material to such religious questions as the use of the Baal compound in Hebrew names and the tenacity with which it continued through Israel's history. On the whole, the article is of great importance to the student of Hebrew history.

Professor Gray calls attention to the fact that Harvard has not yet published a complete report of the collection and that therefore the conclusions are incomplete.

Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism

A brief survey of the working of these two principles in the past in order that we may better understand their relative importance for the future of civilization, is the declared purpose of the author, Rev. R. H. Law, M.A., in an article in the *Hibbert Journal* of January, 1916. The origin of the idea of cosmopolitanism may be traced back beyond the Roman Empire to the Hellenistic world, but it was in the former that it found its most conspicuous development. Through law, religion, language, and schools of rhetoric, Roman culture diffused itself rapidly over the provinces. Military roads and freedom of commerce bound the distant parts of the Empire together and tended to obliterate national distinctions, while the threatened dangers from the barbarian world without intensified this bond of unity. But after all, this unity was largely external, and the essential bond of true spiritual unity was lacking, so that the Empire crumbled before the fierce assaults of her northern enemies. But when the barbarians had overthrown the Empire they found themselves confronted with a further power claiming a yet more august authority, obeyed with a more passionate devotion, invulnerable, invin-

cible, the *imperium in imperio* of the Catholic church. Through the church the various peoples of Western Europe were united together in one mystic commonwealth, sharers in a common faith and in a common hope. This bond was strengthened by the influences of the thousands of students, drawn from every country, who thronged the great universities of Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, and wandered far and wide. The period from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries shows an increasing preponderance of the nationalist over the cosmopolitan spirit; but in the eighteenth century the influence of France became paramount in Western Europe. A new orthodoxy of "Reason" arose of which Voltaire was the evangelist and Rousseau the prophet. The French Revolution, though arising in a glow of cosmopolitan enthusiasm, rapidly became the generator and forcing-house of an intenser nationalism, culminating in the supremacy of Napoleon. But this only stimulated the growth of national self-consciousness among the oppressed peoples and the twin aspirations of Nationality and Liberty were forced into a yet closer union. In the wave of revolution that swept over Europe in 1848 idealists thought they saw the day of liberty and brotherhood dawning at last, but the bourgeois classes took fright and found champions in Louis Napoleon and Bismarck. From this time on the cosmopolitan spirit seemed doomed under the crushing burdens of militarism and national jealousies, but in spite of these the solidarity of human interests has been asserting itself. International commerce and finance and the international sympathies of organized labor, as well as the more ideal agencies, such as religion, philosophy and science, history and literature and education have all contributed to a growing unity. "However momentarily obscured by ignorance or passion, the great basal fact of human solidarity, which is the discovery of the

last one hundred years, is bound with the diffusion of knowledge to receive an increasing recognition. From the agony of Europe the national idea will emerge, strengthened indeed, but also purified of its baser accretions; and the cosmopolitan idea will be welcomed as its necessary complement and condition."

Christian Unity and Co-operation

More progress has been made in the direction of unity and co-operation in the first fifteen years of the twentieth century than in any one hundred years since the Apostolic era; and more steps have been taken in practical co-operation in the last five years, many times over, than in the ten preceding, writes W. W. Pinson, D.D., in the January number of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*. He believes that this modern emphasis on unity and co-operation is in very large measure due to the influence of our missionary leaders and their protest against division with its weakness and waste. But at the same time there are certain determining causes that have made inevitable this drawing together of the Christian forces: in the first place there is the discovery, or realization, that the aim of all bodies of Christians is identical, namely, to make Christ known and loved and obeyed in all the earth. In consequence our points of agreement have been magnified and our points of difference minimized. Then, too, we have discovered the bigness of our common task. As soon as Christendom began to face a billion heathen the overwhelming sense of the bigness of the undertaking utterly eclipsed the petty differences and small contentions that had occupied the churches. And the knowledge of the bigness of the task soon led to a condemnation of the irrational waste of resources in men and money. It was pointed out at the Edinburgh Conference that a proper distribution of the men then in the field would be equal to doubling the number

of missionaries. Even in the United States there are many districts with a large population and very inadequate church service. It would seem that the occupation of the whole field is hopeless except by means of a united Christendom.

Denominational insufficiency in the matter of maintaining Christian universities and the circulation of adequate Christian literature is a further unifying cause. And lastly, the laymen of the church have begun to take a more active interest in missionary and church affairs, and are demanding the application of the efficiency test. And so the question of Christian unity is no longer a mere academic question, but has become one of fundamental practical significance. The missionary conference in New York City in 1900, and the World conference at Edinburgh in 1910 mark stages in the progress of the movement. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America is a further sign of the times. Literature on the subject is growing, two publications worthy of special notice being *Christian Unity at Work* by Dr. Charles S. McFarland, and *Unity and Missions* by Dr. Arthur J. Brown. The Young Men's Christian Association, the International Sunday School Committee, the Christian Student Federation, the Student Volunteer Movement, and the Missionary Education Movement are practical outworkings of the growing spirit of unity, while movements looking toward the organic union of denominations are no longer scoffed at as impossible. "The power that makes for unity is moving upon the hearts of men out of unseen heights, and it were as easy to sweep back the tide with a broom as to check this rising tide of Christian love and brotherhood in action."

Miracles and the Modern Preacher

"In all religions, so far as I know, there are stories of wonderful occurrences that transcend the limits of ordinary experience,"

declares Carl S. Patton in his introduction to an article on "Miracles" in the *American Journal of Theology* for January, 1916. The unsophisticated believer accepts the actuality of these events on two grounds: (1) because they are recorded in his sacred Scriptures; (2) because they seem to be a guaranty to him of the truth and reality of his religion. But there have been a few men in every generation who have occupied a somewhat skeptical attitude on the question, and there are now whole classes of persons who find it quite impossible to believe in miracles of any sort. The steps leading to this position in the case of the individual are generally slow and almost imperceptible. Accepting miracles implicitly as a child, he later begins to draw a distinction between miracles in the Bible and miracles outside the Bible. Then he further distinguishes between different miracles in the Bible, as for example those in the Old Testament and those in the New. He follows with distinctions between miracles within the New Testament, and finally discards all miracles but those of Jesus, which he can still believe because of the unique personality of Jesus. And finally he may come to the position where he ceases to believe in the actuality of miracles at all. The writer gives reasons for his own acceptance of this latter position. He says that the testimony for them is not good enough. He would not believe the testimony of his best friends today if they told him that a man had risen from the dead; much less can he believe the testi-

mony of men whose very names are for the most part unknown to us, and who speak of events happening 2,000 years ago. This does not mean that the men who spoke of these things were deceived, but that the tradition which represents them as observing these things was unconsciously colored in the course of its transmission. He concludes with two practical questions: first, if one is compelled to give up his belief in miracles, is this any loss to him religiously? Does it leave him with less evidence of the power and presence of God? This question he answers in the negative. If God is revealed in the orderly and ordinary processes of human life then an interruption of these can be no addition to his revelation. It can only be a confusion and an interruption of it. Secondly, if any preacher has come to this position in regard to miracles, what shall he do with it in the pulpit? He should not go specifically into the matter of miracles before his congregation so as to plunge them into doubts, but if asked serious questions should answer them honestly. On the other hand, he should preach a religion which, as manifestly as possible, has some other basis than the miraculous. "He will preach a God who is revealed in the processes of nature and the development of human life, who speaks in the reason and conscience of all men and in whom we and all things live and move and have our being. If he has enough else to preach, nobody will miss his reference to the miracles in which he does not believe."